

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT
THE AGRICULTURAL FAIR HELD AT RYE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
ON OCTOBER 1, 1914

By

HON. N. J. BACHELDER

FORMER MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE AND
EX-GOVERNOR OF NEW HAMPSHIRE



PRESENTED BY MR. McCUMBER
OCTOBER 7, 1914.—Ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON
1914

16A



AMERICAN AGRICULTURE NEEDS THE REPUBLICAN POLICY AND TRUE AND TRIED REPUBLICAN LEADERS.

REPUBLICAN UNITY REQUIRED.

As farmers and citizens we are facing this year in the congressional and senatorial elections a political situation that is very unusual. In 1912, when the situation was also unusual, and unprecedented for Republicans, it was my privilege to be called on to address a number of meetings of farmers. I made my plea as earnestly as I could for Republican unity. I tried to point out to the farmers the danger to their interests that would be involved in the defeat of the Republican Party, and what it would mean to have farm products from all over the world admitted into our country free of duty, as the Democratic Party was then planning to do and has since practically accomplished.

Again this year I am glad to have this opportunity to plead for Republican unity. A bitter experience has now emphasized the need of Republican control at Washington. The welfare of all the people requires a prompt return to the sanity and moderation of Republican legislation. All that we can do this year is to provide for Republican legislation by sending Republicans to both branches of Congress. This is the only way by which we can put an end to the destructive Democratic legislation which has been afflicting the country for the last 16 months. This ending of the present intolerable condition should be done with an earnestness and completeness that will be a lasting rebuke to the Democratic administration and inspire confidence in the completion of the work of relief in 1916.

AGRICULTURE THE BASIS OF THE NATIONAL WELFARE.

As agriculture is the basis of the country's welfare, and as the labors and investments of the farmers are to a great extent made fruitless if the country as a whole is not prosperous, it is the duty of the farmers to take the lead in the movements of public opinion and political action which are necessary to lead the country from distress to the prosperity we desire. The farmers labor unremittingly in establishing the basis of the national welfare. Theirs is a persistent, genuine, and abundant service to the country at large. They have rendered this service faithfully ever since the settlement of the country began, and for this service the returns they have received have been poorer in proportion than those of any other class of labor and investment in the country. The farmers have never yet been able to exchange the commodities of their labor on equal terms with the products of the labor of others. Only within a few years have they been approaching a condition in this country wherein they could exchange their products on just and equal terms. And the approach of such a condition is the approach of the time when agriculture shall take its proper place among the industries of the

Nation, and when those engaged in agriculture shall have their equal share in the prosperity of the Nation, and they and their children have as good a return for their labor and investment as are realized from other business enterprises.

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S GREAT REPUBLICAN LEADER AND HIS WORK FOR AGRICULTURE.

I am especially glad to be able to speak at this time, as a farmer to farmers, concerning the interests of agriculture in relation to the elections this year, because these elections in New Hampshire will include a popular vote for a member of the United States Senate from our State, and because in this vote an opportunity is given to our people to return to the Senate a very distinguished representative of New Hampshire interests, who has by his ability and earnestness won a high place among the leaders of the Nation in Congress, and who has all through his long and devoted service been a remarkably capable and courageous defender of the agricultural interests of our State and of the whole country.

The Hon. Jacob H. Gallinger is one of the national leaders of the Republican Party, and the farmers of New Hampshire, as well as all other citizens, owe it to their own interests to reelect him to the United States Senate, and thus provide for the continuance of that leadership which has been so helpful to our State and to all New England. The farmers of New Hampshire owe an especial debt of gratitude to Senator Gallinger. In speaking of his services to our agricultural interests I am speaking not of some matters of which I have merely read or heard, but I am speaking of matters of which I have direct and intimate personal knowledge.

It was my experience to take an active part a few years ago in resisting a serious attack on the welfare of the farmers, and Senator Gallinger worked so earnestly in our behalf in this matter and fought so steadily and effectively for our interests all through the affair, and with such thoroughgoing sincerity and unselfishness, that I feel that I can never adequately express my sense of gratitude and obligation to him on behalf of the farmers. I would certainly be failing in my duty to the farmers of this State, who were so intensely concerned for their industry in this matter, if I did not speak earnestly on this occasion about Senator Gallinger's great work for us.

THE ATTEMPTED CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

We all remember the Canadian reciprocity act of 1911, against which the northern farmers so vigorously protested. When the reciprocity agreement was made and the legislation based thereon brought before Congress at Washington, I happened to be the master of the National Grange, and as such the chairman of the legislative committee of that great organization. It became my duty to take an active part in expressing the opposition of the farmers to this measure, and to go to Washington with delegations of farmers from a great many States, and to appear at hearings there before the Finance Committee of the Senate to state the reasons for the opposition of the farmers and to appeal in the name of Republican farmers, generally, against the passage of the reciprocity act, which would have opened our markets to free imports of Canadian farm products.

I was in Washington a great deal during the months our struggle lasted. I saw at first hand the way in which Senator Gallinger took up our cause and fought for it. I saw him day after day in the hearings before the Finance Committee, of which committee, the leading committee of the Senate, he has long been a valued member. I heard his questions and vigorous statements, all helping to bring out and drive home the facts which we representatives of the farmers were trying to place before the committee. I saw that it was his skill and determination which was one of the principal forces that secured for the representatives of agriculture a fair and complete hearing with all the time we required for stating our case. And I may say here that except for the thoroughness and length of these hearings, so obtained for us, the Canadian reciprocity treaty would have been enacted into law. The fact is that it was the duration of these complete hearings which so delayed the inevitable passage of the act in our Congress that the measure could not be passed in the Canadian Parliament before the event of the general election in that country which was then in prospect. This general election brought up peculiar political questions in Canada which were affected by the reciprocity treaty and proved to be the opportunity and occasion of the defeat of this unfortunate measure. And so it was actually due to Senator Gallinger's thorough work for us at Washington that we were saved from the actual enactment of this reciprocity.

And not only in the hearings, but also throughout the debate in the Senate on the reciprocity act, I saw Senator Gallinger day after day defending the interests of the New Hampshire farmers and constantly resisting the passage of the act by able argument, based on exact knowledge of the facts. This hard-working Senator, who was born on a farm, proved in this great debate that he had an extensive, first-hand knowledge of agricultural affairs as well as a keen sense of justice for them and unyielding courage to fight for such justice.

He fought for our cause with faithfulness and effectiveness that no man could excel all through the long hearings and through the long debate and through the voting to the last, standing firm in voting for our cause against the strongest kind of presidential pressure and congressional and party appeals.

Those of us who have lived long and seen much know that we do not very often find such complete devotion to a cause that is struggling against superior force and seemingly impassable obstacles. This reciprocity struggle of ours was an uphill fight and extremely difficult. All the power and influence of the national administration were against us, the majority in Congress were against us, all the tremendous power of the newspaper press of the great cities was against us, and it seemed that the consuming masses in the cities, not understanding clearly what was necessary for the real increase in the supply of food products which they desired, were also against us. Inasmuch as, under these strenuous circumstances, Senator Gallinger stood and worked unflinchingly for us, fairness and justice require that we stand by him in the present contest. I would consider that I were failing in my duty as a farmer and a citizen and as an honorable man if I did not do everything in my power to urge the people of my State to return him, by a large majority, to that place in the United States Senate which he has made such a great national force for the credit and welfare of New Hampshire.

Senator Gallinger also stood up for our interests in every possible way during the debates on the tariff law which has been inflicted on us. In all of this greater attack on our interests he has been always vigilant, thoroughly equipped in knowledge, and working for us without sparing himself. The new tariff is for the farmers the most important issue at this time, and the elections this year will practically determine whether or not it is to be changed so as to do justice to the farmers. If the farmers wish to have it so changed, this can only be done by the election of men like Senator Gallinger.

THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY AND ITS FAILURE.

There are a great many people who have been for a long time accustomed to think that the farmers should be content if they obtain a bare living as a result of their laborious work. This idea has grown up because the farmers have been seen toiling away for generation after generation and receiving no more than a bare living. So it has seemed that this was all that was necessary for the farmers, and that the industrial prosperity and wealth of the country could go on steadily increasing under such circumstances, although springing from the great agricultural production wrested from the soil by the farmers.

Out of this idea has come the plan of the Democratic Party to put the farmers of the United States in open competition with the entire world, with the cheapest labor and the cheapest land to be found anywhere, in order to make the products of American farms sell as cheaply as possible, and thus, if possible, reduce the cost of living in the cities, to the greater advantage of the people and the industries therein. This plan has been carried out in the Democratic tariff enacted last year, which at one stroke put farm products practically on the free list.

This plan is now clearly recognized as an entire failure. It has not reduced the cost of living in the cities. It has, however, been a discouragement and setback to agriculture. Since the enactment of this Democratic tariff imports of farm products have been coming into our country from wherever in the world they are cheapest—from the cheap labor of China, Japan, and Manchuria, and from the cheap lands of Argentina and Australia. Very substantial quantities of these imports have come in, and they have had a decided effect upon our wholesale domestic prices. It is not, however, the quantity which comes in that is the most important factor in these importations. It is the fact of the importations of such products of the cheapest labor and conditions at very low or no rates of duty that really counts and does the great injury. For it is this fact—our condition of open receptivity, free of duty, to such products—that discourages our own farmers and prevents them from applying the additional labor and investment required for the proper development of our own agricultural resources.

THE GREAT INJURY IN THE DISCOURAGEMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

The recent Democratic legislation, so damaging in many ways to the general welfare of the country, is peculiarly injurious and strangely shortsighted in that part of it which strikes out the duties on farm products. To the enlightened statesmanship among our

people it has been clear for a long time that the principal reason for the great and unhealthy drift of population from country to city, for the loss from the farms of so much of the youth and energy developed by the agricultural people, has been the fact that the hard life on the farms has yielded no more than a bare living. It is no wonder that the younger generations of farmers seek other occupations promising greater rewards for their energy and intelligence. Under these circumstances, when the crying need of agriculture, and hence the great need of the country, is that farming be made more profitable and attractive, the Democratic Party, in its doctrinaire attachment to the delusive free-trade theory, makes American agriculture less profitable and attractive and hence retards the development and productiveness of the great areas of unused and insufficiently used land in the country.

Such development would be a very important factor in overcoming the high cost of living which is now giving the Democratic Party so much trouble. It is certain that the greater our own supply of foodstuffs, the easier will be the conditions of life for all our people, and this principle applies as well to other commodities. It is clear and generally admitted that one of the principal causes of the high cost of living has been the great drift of population from country to city which I have referred to. Everyone can see that if this changing population or a great part of it had remained in the country to increase the production of lands now cultivated and to go on to the development of new lands, the adjustment of the supplies from the country and the demands from the cities would have been more normal and satisfactory. As it is, the extraordinary increase of city population has brought to a head problems of distribution which are also an important factor in the high cost of living. It is well known that the cost of distributing farm products to the consumers is unreasonably high, and this is doubly an injury to the farmers, for it takes from the price which the farmers ought to receive and at the same time creates the impression among the consumers in the cities that the farmers are receiving very high prices for their products. These consumers do not realize the cost of the mere distribution of these products to them.

A great deal of excellent work has been done by farmers and others toward the solution of these problems of distribution. Through the granges and other organizations of farmers and by various methods of mutual cooperation the farmers have been working out improved methods of marketing their products with the minimum of waste and delay. This matter is so important for producers and consumers both that the city people ought to lend their aid in every way possible in establishing such improved methods. There are, in fact, many indications that the city people are now becoming aroused to this great need, and it may be said that with the intelligent attention now being given to this matter there will be a steady improvement. This is being accomplished by farmers and citizens generally without regard to party affiliations or administration affairs.

DEMOCRATIC INCAPACITY IN DEALING WITH THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

In relation to the general increase of prices which constitutes what is known as the high cost of living, the Democratic Party has made another glaring exhibition of its usual weakness and incapacity.

This increase of prices has been world-wide. If it has been greater in the United States than elsewhere, this would be only a natural consequence of the unusually great increase of city population in comparison with rural which has been experienced in this country. But all over the world there has been a general increase of prices, and economists and statesmen generally have recognized it as a world phenomenon. The prevailing opinion seems to be that the underlying cause of it is the cheaper and greater production of gold, causing a depreciation in the exchange value of gold, which, of course, is equivalent to and indicated by an appreciation or increase in the values at which the other commodities will exchange for a fixed quantity of gold like a dollar. But whether this be the true explanation or not, it is certain that the real cause of the high cost of living is not national but international. The Republican administration which we had at Washington until March, 1913, realizing this, sought to establish an international scientific commission to discover the causes and the remedies.

This was the way to deal fairly and effectively with the difficulty. Good progress was made under the Republican administration toward the establishment of such a commission, but with the incoming of the Democratic administration this matter was set aside. The Democratic Party had the deliberate purpose of destroying the protective tariff, and it professed and spread the theory that this tariff was the real cause of the high cost of living. The Democratic Party promised the people that with the destruction of the tariff the cost of living would be greatly lowered and that greater prosperity than ever before would spread throughout the country. Going to the people with this promise and facing only a divided opposition, the Democratic Party secured control.

DEMOCRATIC FREE TRADE FOR THE NORTHERN FARMERS.

And with this control, although never conferred by a majority of the people, this Democratic Party, which has time and again brought affliction upon the country, at once proceeded to destroy the protective tariff, which had brought to the country a great development and an abundant prosperity that were the envy of the rest of the world. As quickly as possible the Democratic Party enacted a tariff law that destroyed as much of the protective tariff as they possibly could at one time, and at this time they took care to take all the protection out of the tariff as far as the farmers are concerned. They practically established free trade in farm products as they had practically declared they would.

This Democratic tariff singled out the products of the farm for entirely disproportionate and unfair treatment. Free trade was thrust upon the northern farmers by a minority party having temporary power through a rare political accident. The duties on corn, wheat, potatoes, eggs, milk and cream, wool, cattle, swine and sheep, meats, and certain other agricultural products were entirely swept away. The duties on oats, hay, butter and cheese, fruit, and other products were so greatly reduced that anything like protection was eliminated. The official figures have now been published, showing the results under this tariff for the first nine months of its operation. During these nine months, from October 3, 1913, to June 30, 1914, there was an increase in the imports of foodstuffs amounting to

\$73,000,000. The increase in all imports during this time was \$82,000,000, so that foodstuffs made up about nine-tenths of this increase.

THE COST OF LIVING NOT REDUCED TO THE CONSUMERS.

But, notwithstanding this great flood of imports of farm products, the cost of living has been reduced not at all to the consumers. After an experience of nearly a year the Democratic promise to reduce the cost of living stands forth as a confessed humbug. Every consideration for the American farmers was thrown away, and the result is nothing but failure of the professed purpose or of any useful purpose. It was predicted by the Republicans that the sacrifice of the American market to the foreigners would result in no advantage to the consumers, and that the foreigners would, through an increase of their prices, capitalize or convert to their own enrichment as much as possible of the great economic advantage given to them by our Government. This has happened to a great extent. On a large number of the articles on which the tariff was removed or greatly reduced the import prices abroad have been advanced.

THE DEMOCRATIC INJURY FAR GREATER THAN IS INDICATED BY THE ACTUAL IMPORTS.

But such advance, or the fact that actual imports have not yet been of very great volume in some cases, does not in any way alter or diminish the serious effect of the removal or reduction of the duties in our tariff law. This effect is that our ports remain constantly open to the admission free of duty, or at insignificant rates of duty, of the products of all foreign countries, so that these products can be poured into our markets at any time. The fact that this open competition in our own country from the cheapest labor and meanest conditions to be found in the world is always at hand and always ready to bring in the products the moment any stiffening of demand or improvement in price makes the desired commercial opportunity for the foreigners—this fact acts unavoidably as a discouragement and repression to our own people all over the land and is really of more importance than the actual quantity of imports which may be brought in during any period of time. As an illustration of this, I noticed about a month ago in one of the leading commercial journals a comment about the domestic market for eggs, in which it was said that values might be held down because of the expectation of liberal importations later in the season from the larger stocks held in Europe.

As a matter of fact, the actual imports under the Democratic tariff of farm products from all over the world have been very great. New England, from its geographical position, must feel the most serious effect of the bulk of these imports, as well as a large share in the effect of the ever-present prospect of other and additional imports.

DAIRY PRODUCTS.

New England is greatly interested in the market for dairy products. On these products the Democratic tariff made a very severe reduction. The duty on butter was reduced from 6 cents to $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, a reduction of about 60 per cent. It has had a great effect. We have now at hand the statistics of imports for the first nine months of the Democratic tariff, ending June 30, 1914. For the corresponding nine months one year before, from October 1,

1912, to June 30, 1913, under the Republican tariff, the imports of butter and substitutes therefor were 980,622 pounds, valued at \$258,367. For the nine months ended June 30, 1914, under the Democratic tariff, the imports amounted to the great total of 7,390,147 pounds, valued at \$1,646,408. This was an increase of 6,409,525 pounds, valued at \$1,388,041. This increase in nine months is considerably more than the annual production of New Hampshire as reported by the census of 1910.

The Democratic Party also made a great reduction in the duty on cheese. The Republican rate of duty was 6 cents per pound. The Democratic rate is 20 per cent ad valorem. The Republican specific rate was equivalent to about 32 per cent ad valorem in 1912, a normal year, so that the Democratic reduction is almost 40 per cent. During the first nine months under the Democratic tariff the increase in the imports of cheese and substitutes for cheese amounted to the substantial quantity of 12,306,013 pounds, valued at \$1,747,136. The annual production of cheese in New Hampshire reported by the last census is 180,996 pounds, so that this increase is just about 68 times the production in our State in a whole year.

The Republican Party maintained a duty on fresh milk of 2 cents per gallon and on condensed milk of 2 cents per pound. On cream the Republican duty was 5 cents per gallon. The Democratic tariff has swept these duties away entirely and made cream as well as fresh and condensed milk absolutely free of duty. The increase in the imports of cream during the first nine months of the Democratic tariff over the corresponding nine months one year before under the Republican tariff was 316,426 gallons, valued at \$282,253. The increase in the imports of milk, fresh and condensed, during the same period amounted to \$930,678 in value. The yearly production of cream in New Hampshire in 1909, as reported by the census of 1910, was 380,944 gallons, and of fresh milk 35,033,153 gallons.

OATS.

The Democratic rate of duty on oats is only 6 cents per bushel, as against 15 cents, which was the rate under the Republican tariff. The reduction is 60 per cent. While the Republican tariff was in force the imports for the nine months ended June 30, 1913, amounted to 79,966 bushels, valued at \$37,678. In the corresponding nine months ended June 30, 1914, the first nine months under the Democratic tariff, the imports amounted to 22,276,137 bushels, valued at \$7,882,733. The increase in imports during this period is 22,196,171 bushels, or more than 57 times the yearly production of New Hampshire as given by the last census.

POTATOES.

On potatoes the Republican Party maintained the rate of duty at 25 cents per bushel. The Democratic tariff admits potatoes free of duty when imported from countries which do not impose a duty on potatoes from the United States, or at the low rate of 10 per cent ad valorem if imported from other countries. The imports of the Democratic nine months have been 3,622,492 bushels, omitting sweet potatoes, valued at \$1,746,402. In the corresponding Republican nine months the corresponding imports were 308,960 bushels, valued at \$279,103. The Democratic increase is 3,313,532 bushels, valued at

\$1,465,299. The entire production of potatoes in New Hampshire in 1909 was 2,360,241 bushels, or much less than this Democratic increase.

HAY.

The Republican duty on hay of \$4 per ton was cut to \$2. In the nine months of the Democratic rate 143,865 tons have been imported. This is an increase of 37,279 tons over the imports in the corresponding period under the Republican rate.

SHEEP.

Sheep are entirely free of duty under the Democratic tariff, and wool is also free since December 1, 1913. The Republican rate of duty on wool averaged about 43½ per cent in 1912. On sheep the Republican rate was 75 cents per head if less than 1 year old, and \$1.50 per head if more than 1 year old; and in 1912 these specific duties averaged from 14 to nearly 19 per cent ad valorem. The statistics now at hand show the imports of sheep for the nine months from October, 1913, to June, 1914, both inclusive. During this period the total was 221,129 sheep, valued at \$491,648. During the corresponding period under the Republican rates the imports were only 13,330 sheep, valued at \$74,117. The increase is almost five times the total number of sheep in New Hampshire reported by the census of 1910.

EGGS.

Democratic free trade in eggs is also bringing to our shores great quantities of this article, a product which means a great deal to the domestic economy of American farmers and their wives and daughters. Under the Republican tariff eggs were dutiable at 5 cents per dozen. The imports under this rate were not separately reported by months, but during the entire fiscal year which ended Jun 30, 1913, only 1,271,765 dozen eggs were imported. During the first nine months under Democratic free trade, three-fourths of a year, the imports of eggs have amounted to the enormous total of 5,832,725 dozen. Of course, the principal importations of eggs only come in during the winter months. After the enactment of the Democratic tariff last October it took some little time to make the necessary preparations for importations under the new conditions. The really large importations of eggs did not begin to come in until December last. It must be expected that the imports of next winter will be far greater than those of last winter. And even last winter eggs came into the United States markets from the most remote countries, from China and Japan, where farm laborers receive something like 42 cents a week, and from other countries wherein standards of living prevail that are radically different from ours. It is now announced by the brokers that since the Panama Canal is opened China can lay down eggs in the port of New York at an average cost of 12 cents a dozen.

I remember well how Senator Gallinger, in the reciprocity hearings and the reciprocity debate and in the debates on the Democratic tariff bills, stated time and again the situation that would prevail in the importation of these and other articles under free trade in farm products, and kept on showing in detail the injury to our farmers involved in such proposal. I remember how he showed by figures the great production in Canada of oats, hay, and other products, and how

they would be poured into our Northern markets under such free trade, predictions which have been justified by results.

FRUITS AND OTHER PRODUCTS.

I have briefly sketched these typical instances of farm products in which we are interested as they are dealt with by the Democratic tariff, in order to make clear the situation which is thus imposed on American agriculture all along the line. I might go on to speak in a similar way of other products—of fruits, of buckwheat, of vegetables, and other articles of importance to American farmers. There has been a wonderful development in the production of fruits in this country under the protective tariff. Most of us can remember the time when, except for such fruits as apples, pears, peaches, quinces, and berries, our country imported practically all other fruits. To-day we produce in large and increasing quantities excellent oranges, lemons, and grapefruit. Great areas devoted to the production of such fruits have been developed in Florida, California, and elsewhere, and this development has been a source of wealth and prosperity to the whole country.

DEMOCRATIC SPECIAL FAVORS FOR SOUTHERN FARMERS.

In referring to this development I am obliged, in fairness to the people of our State and all the Northern States, to refer also to the narrow and unfortunate sectional spirit in which the Democratic Party has overthrown the protective tariff. The Democratic Party has professed devotion to the theory of free trade. Especially have the Democratic Members of Congress from the Southern States been foremost in working for and applying this theory. They call it a principle which ought to be accepted by all. The present Democratic tariff, the most radically low tariff we have ever had, was framed throughout by Democrats from the Southern States. They dominated the committees which determined the rates or eliminated them, and the caucuses which ratified what was done, and amendments were forbidden by the rules enacted by these men through their power in command of the Democratic Party machine in Congress. There was little or no Northern influence in the making of this tariff.

And in this tariff southern agricultural products are treated with much more friendly consideration than northern products. The duties on the fruits such as are produced by the northern farmers are cut down to very low rates, but lemons and oranges such as are produced in Florida are given a substantial and protective duty. Wool, a product of the Northern States, comes in free of duty, but the hair of the Angora goat, a product of Texas, is granted a protective duty. Potatoes, a product of northern farmers, are on the free list; but peanuts, an important product of the farmers of Virginia, North Carolina, and other Southern States, have the benefit of a protective duty. Corn, buckwheat, and other grains such as are raised by northern farmers, are admitted free of duty, but rice, a great product of southern farmers, continues to enjoy a protective duty.

We who have felt the effects of free trade in the agricultural products of the North are not at all sorry that our more fortunate fellow farmers of the South are enjoying the benefits of a protective tariff which has been denied to us. Protection has helped them on

to a great development, and will continue to do so, and this development has added to the welfare of the whole country, and will go on doing so. This protection to the southern farmers was established by the Republican Party. When this policy is continued for southern farmers in a Democratic tariff framed by southern men it is a practical confession of the strongest kind that this policy is right, that it encourages production, that it brings greater welfare to both producers and consumers, and goes hand in hand with prosperity for all. An ounce of fact is worth more than a ton of mere argument.

We have this to be proud of in the record of the Republican Party: That it extended the blessings of its wise economic policy over all the people all over the country, without favoritism to any section or class; that it represented and served faithfully the people of the United States, and never professed one thing and performed another for the exclusive benefit of some preferred section. The protective tariff which we northern farmers used to enjoy was given to us by the Republican Party, just as it was given to all American farmers and to American manufacturers as well. It brought a great development of American agriculture and American manufactures both. We need more of such development. We need it especially in agriculture, and the consumers in the cities need it just as much as we do, if not more so. We can get it only through and from the Republican Party, which gave us the necessary policy before and stands ready to do so again. The obstacle which must be overcome is the Democratic Party, whose policy has been not only unwise but also unfair to us and really insincere. By united action as Republicans we can remove this obstacle from our path and go forward again under that tried and successful Republican policy which we require and demand.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

I would make an especial appeal to all American farmers at this time to be on their guard against permitting the special circumstances now prevailing as an incident of the great European war to influence in any way their attitude and action toward the real issue affecting the permanent welfare of American agriculture. The terrible and destructive war now going on in Europe broke suddenly and unexpectedly, and necessarily upsets for the time being the usual commercial transactions and methods. It blocks imports and exports as well. As to agricultural products as well as other products, imports are suddenly cut off and the artificial scarcity of the moment causes abnormal increase in prices and sometimes violent fluctuations.

For example, I saw in the commercial reports in the newspapers concerning the market for eggs in New York City on August 3 a statement to the effect that the war situation in Europe created the expectation that importations of eggs might be impossible, and that this had greatly strengthened the views of holders and created a general speculative buying and firmer prices. And the New York Journal of Commerce of August 6, after mentioning 1,250 cases of eggs which had just come in from London, said, "The imports to-day are doubtless the last to arrive as long as present conditions abroad continue." These commercial reports of this and subsequent dates mentioned imports of quantities of beans and peas from London and also from France and Italy. And yet within a day or two thereafter the same newspaper reported cable inquiries from Great Britain

for 65,000 bags of potatoes and 50,000 bags of dried beans, with a sensational advance in the price of beans. On August 5 it was reported in the New York newspapers that all imports of cheese had been shut off, and that as soon as the conditions were understood the owners of foreign cheese in storage advanced the price 10 cents per pound.

These things illustrate the sudden changes in the flow of commodities caused by war, and prices change even more suddenly than the flow. But with the end of war in sight or in prospect the change of flow and price back again to the former conditions may be equally sudden. While the war lasts its effect in impeding or blocking imports will give for the moment a great advantage to the American sellers of farm products and manufactured products in our home market and also in certain export markets.

But this temporary advantage is an entirely different thing from the reasonable and lasting advantage in the American market which the Republican protective tariff policy gave and which Senator Gallinger struggled to maintain for American producers. It is out of the question to plan and provide for increased production and continuous increased production when the situation hangs upon the brief, uncertain accident of war. It must be remembered also that while the war lasts our agricultural exports will be blocked more than will be the agricultural imports coming to our shores, for such exports go principally to the great European countries which are at war, while the imports come principally from the South American and Asiatic countries, from Australia, and from such countries in Europe as Holland and Denmark, which are not involved in the war. And we know by experience that any advantage from higher prices in war time goes almost entirely to the speculators and not to the producers. But the result, as it is the purpose, of the deliberate and permanent policy of a protective tariff is to bring continually increasing production by American producers, which secures their welfare and that of the American consumers in the only practicable way and through them makes for the welfare of the world at large.

OUR NATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR INCREASED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION.

It is the duty of citizens of the United States to develop the resources of their own great country. This truth finds general acceptance, but an idea prevails among many people that we have by this time come somewhere near the end of our national resources for increased agricultural production. Such an idea is far from the truth. This idea has been unthinkingly held by a great many of our most conscientious and patriotic fellow citizens, and has been a great influence in leading numbers of them, especially in the cities, to mistakenly support or permit the Democratic policy of free trade for American agriculture.

The fact is—and this should be understood by all the city people and by all the farmers too—that we have so far made just a good beginning in developing agricultural production from American soil. We have enormous areas of undeveloped lands in our country. In a number of the Western States agriculture is only in the early stages of its development. For example, it was pointed out by Senator McCumber, of North Dakota, in a very instructive address delivered by him before the Massachusetts State Grange last year, that in his own

State only about one-quarter of the prairie sod had been turned over. In this address Senator McCumber went on to say:

Eastern Montana, an empire in itself, has scarcely been scratched by the plow. Just as soon as farming can be made profitable, all that soil will respond to the consumptive demand of the country and will supply that demand for centuries to come. Mr. James J. Hill, who has made a careful study of our agricultural possibilities, asserts and demonstrates that we can raise in the United States all the food we will need to supply 800,000,000 people.

Here are the possibilities of food production. There is a rapid increase in the world's production in excess of the increase in the world's population, and the world's level of prices will necessarily be low. With our doors thrown open to the food products of the world, we must sell on the world's level of prices. Will you be satisfied with this low level, with an ever-widening gap between city earnings and farm earnings?

Well-informed men of all parties who live in the States of great undeveloped agricultural possibilities, or know the conditions there, join in calling attention to the great tracts of American land calling for cultivation and adequate development. In fact, the present Democratic administration itself calls attention to these lands and their tremendous opportunities, and explicitly admits that we have only begun our agricultural development. As far as agriculture is concerned, the leading authority in the administration at Washington is the Secretary of Agriculture. He is himself from the great State of Texas, whose area is more than 28 times that of New Hampshire. In his latest annual report the United States Secretary of Agriculture said:

The situation is one about which many have become pessimistic; but, of course, there is no ground for thinking that we have yet approximated the limit of our output from the soil. As a matter of fact, we have just begun to attack the problem; we have not even reached the end of the pioneering stage, and have only in a few localities developed conditions where reasonably full returns are secured. With a population of less than 95,000,000, living on more than 3,000,000 square miles, it is unreasonable to speak as if our territory had been much more than pioneered. * * *

Look at it from another point of view. According to the best statistics available, it appears that the total arable land in the Union is approximately 935,000,000 acres; that only about 400,000,000 of this is included in farms and improved; that over 100,000,000 is unimproved, and not included in farms; and the remainder is unimproved lands included in farms. But there is another thought. What about the efficiency of the work on the land now under cultivation? What part of it may be said to be reasonably efficiently cultivated? What part of it is satisfactorily cultivated, and is yielding reasonably full returns? The opportunity for guessing in this field is unlimited, but according to the best guesses I can secure it appears that less than 40 per cent of the land is reasonably well cultivated, and less than 12 per cent is yielding fairly full returns, or returns considerably above the average.

These millions of good American acres are to-day nonproductive simply because American farmers can not at this time meet the expense for labor involved in cultivating them. The demand for food products up to this time has not been great enough to warrant the outlay for the labor. To those who are studying our agricultural conditions closely it is clear that the American farmers are not making enough money per acre. It is a fact that with the higher wages for labor, shorter hours, and better standards of living generally, farmers are really not enjoying enough prosperity to permit the greatest efficiency. With better returns for the enterprise of the farmers, which would be secured by maintaining for them their proper advantage in the American market, the normal conditions of demand and supply, in connection with the improved methods of distribution which are being worked out, would bring it about that

gradually but steadily the unused acres would be used and the used acres more efficiently used, and in this way—the really sensible and truly constructive way—the permanent welfare of the whole consuming and producing public would be accomplished.

It is only by this way—the way which the Republican policy provides and which Senator Gallinger is earnestly laboring to establish—that the difficulties of the much-discussed cost of living can be solved. The Democratic way of free trade in agricultural products is giving and can give no help to the consuming public. It may help certain great trusts to make more money by using foreign products in place of American products, but it is well known that none of this advantage gets to the consumers.

THE CONFESSED FAILURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY.

The Democratic Party practically admits the failure of its policy as to agriculture. There has been none of the promised reduction in the cost of living, and they do not now claim that there has been or is likely to be as a result of the removal or reduction of duties. Their leading authority on agriculture, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, to whom I have already referred, in his latest annual report, from which I have before quoted, writes these significant words:

We have been suddenly brought face to face with the fact that in many directions further production waits on better distribution and that the field of distribution presents problems which raise in very grave ways the simple issue of justice. That under existing conditions in many instances the farmer does not get what he should for his product; that the consumer is required to pay an unfair price; and that unnecessary burdens are imposed under the existing systems of distribution, there can be no question.

And so it is now clearly seen that further production from the great basic industry of American agriculture, which alone can help the consumers, waits upon better distribution of the products and better recompense to the producers. Both of these necessary conditions are impeded or prevented by the Democratic policy. Both have been greatly advanced by the Republican policy. Hence it should be apparent to all farmers and to all the friends of the farmers, and as well to the real friends of the American consumers of food products, that the Democratic policy is a blunder that should be repaired at the earliest possible moment.

The moment for the first steps in its repair is at hand. We are about to choose our Representatives in Congress and a member of the United States Senate from New Hampshire. We must send Republicans to the lower branch of Congress in order to make the beginning of repairing the Democratic blunders. And for the same work, the most important work that is to engage the attention of the American people for the next few years, we must send back to the United States Senate that great leader, who has been one of the ablest and devoted friends of the Republican policy, Senator Gallinger. He has in his long and distinguished service at Washington acquired so much experience and shown so much ability and won so much respect from all his colleagues, that his strength to serve our cause is greater than ever before, and in the period of construction work to come he can be, and I am sure will be, a leader whose work will be of value beyond our ability to fully realize at this time.